

## United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Putent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO	
09/781,697	02/12/2001	Hagan P. Bayley	4210.001200	1449	
7.	590 03/13/2003				
Scott Reese, Ph.D Howrey, Simon, Arnold & White, LLP 750 Bering Drive			EXAMINER		
			TRAN, MY CHAU T		
Houston, TX 77057-2198		1	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1639		
			DATE MAILED: 03/13/2003	DATE MAILED: 03/13/2003	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Applicati n N .	Applicant(s)
•		
Advisory Action	09/781,697	BAYLEY ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	My-Chau T. Tran	1639
The MAILING DATE of this communication app	ears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address
THE REPLY FILED 13 February 2003 FAILS TO PLACE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1 condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appearance (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	ivoid abandonment of this applic 1) a timely filed amendment which	ation. A proper reply to a character the application in
PERIOD FOR R	EPLY [check either a) or b)]	
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the maili		
b)  The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WA 706.07(f).	later than SIX MONTHS from the mailir	ng date of the final rejection.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Off timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37	of extension and the corresponding amount of the shortened statutory period for reply fice later than three months after the ma	ount of the fee. The appropriate extension originally set in the final Office action; or
<ol> <li>A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant'</li> <li>37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CF</li> </ol>		
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered by	ecause:	
(a) Ithey raise new issues that would require furth	ner consideration and/or search (	(see NOTE below);
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note	below);	
(c) ☑ they are not deemed to place the application issues for appeal; and/or	in better form for appeal by mate	erially reducing or simplifying the
(d) they present additional claims without cance	ling a corresponding number of t	finally rejected claims.
NOTE:		
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection	tion(s):	
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	d be allowable if submitted in a s	eparate, timely filed amendment
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request fo application in condition for allowance because: Se		idered but does NOT place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaused by the Examiner in the final rejection.	cause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which were newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims were		
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		
Claim(s) allowed: none.		
Claim(s) objected to: <u>none</u> .		
Claim(s) rejected: 32-38 (for reasons of record).		
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		
8. The proposed drawing correction filed on is	s a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapp	proved by the Examiner.
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Stateme	ent(s)( PTO-1449) Paper No(s).	
10. Other:		
		ANDREWWANG
		PERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER TECHNALL HAY CENTER 1600

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office

PTO-303 (Rev. 04-01)

**Advisory Action** 

Continuation of 2. NOTE: The addition of the limitation of "an exogenous sensing moiety capable of preferentially binding with a specific analyte" to claim 32 were not previously presented and their consideration would necessitate new search and examination to determine patentability.

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The proposed amendment to Claim 32 was not entered for reasons set forth above in #2. Further, applicant arguments are most since they are based on the proposed amendment that have not been entered.